

PCC FACULTY ASSOCIATION
 1570 E. Colorado Bl. U-248
 Pasadena, CA 91106
 (626) 585-7261
facultyassociation@gmail.com

PCCFA Leadership Board

Roger Marheine

President

rmarheine@pasadena.edu

Preston Rose

Vice-President &

Part Time Faculty Liaison

pfrose@pasadena.edu

Jane Hallinger

Secretary

jshallinger@pasadena.edu

Danny Hamman

Treasurer

dehamman@pasadena.edu

Krista Walter

Director/Newsletter Editor

kristawalter@hotmail.com

Martha Bonilla

Director

mebonilla@pasadena.edu

Tony Jugé

Director

tsjuge@pasadena.edu

Rod Foster

Director

wrfoster@pasadena.edu

Suzanne Anderson

Past-President & Grievance Officer

saanderson@pasadena.edu

Julie Kiotas

Grievance Officer

ajkiotas@pasadena.edu

BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING: A MAGNIFICENT MOMENT! WE ARE PCC! WE WILL BE HEARD!

The November 2nd Board of Trustees meeting witnessed an explosion of faculty dissent as a chorus of voices declared their anger and frustration with the college's rush to realignment. Over 50 faculty attended and approximately a dozen spoke. It was truly a magnificent moment of eloquence and substance—an expression professional integrity that our students experience daily but which management hardly acknowledges and Board members barely know. Faculty solidarity and passionate educational commitment are the pulse of our college. Along with staff and students, we are PCC United. We are the 99%!

Save the Winter Session! However, we cannot rest! As numerous committees and subcommittees convene on a plethora of realignment concerns, we must not forget the downsizing of our campus offerings. We must save our Winter Session! Over 120 sections have been cut from Winter 2012 compared to Winter 2011. That means 3600 students (at 30 students per section) will not be able to get their classes. Dozens of Full Time and Part Time faculty will not have jobs. **PCCFA calls for all faculty and students to speak out against the cuts at the next Board of Trustees Meeting, Wednesday, December 14, at 7 PM in the Creveling Lounge.**

PART TIME FACULTY CONCERNS ABOUT ELIMINATION OF WINTER INTERSESSION

Rumors suggest that the college wants to change the current academic calendar. While no specifics have been forthcoming, suggestions are that the college wants to eliminate the Winter Intercession, move Spring semester starting time to January, and have two Summer Intercessions. This proposed schedule may sound familiar to many who have been here in the last decade, since it is the schedule that was abandoned almost ten years ago for our present calendar.

Part time faculty have a large stake in any change to the current PCC calendar because part time faculty, unlike full-time faculty, have to balance their PCC class assignments with other colleges' calendars. And the reality is that even now, when the PCC calendar is in general alignment with other campuses, conflicts arise. Currently, the three closest districts, Glendale, Santa Monica, and the nine campuses of the Los Angeles Community College District, do not have concurrent start and end dates for their respective Spring semesters and Winter intercessions. Just to sample the confusion the part time person has to deal with, consider that the campuses of the LACCD begin a five week Winter Intercession on January 3, Santa Monica begins a six week Intercession on January 3, and PCC begins a six week Intercession January 10. (Glendale has cancelled Winter.) Thus, Spring semester begins at LACCD on February 6, at Santa Monica on February 13, and at PCC on February 22 (Glendale has not posted a Spring Schedule at the time of writing). Got all that straight?

Such conflicts are costly to the part time faculty member, the college, and, in particular, the students. Part Time Faculty can be teaching two classes at two different campuses at the same time, which is a tribute to their dedication but not a receipt for long term health or stability. The part time faculty member has to find substitutes at both schools as he or she tries to juggle the start of Spring semester while still teaching in Winter Intercession. Further, students have difficulty settling into a class where the teacher keeps changing and where the teacher of record is not available to sign off on an add slip or answer questions about the class.

Continued on Page 2...

...Continued from Page 1

If the suggested changes to PCC's calendar were initiated, these conflicts would only be intensified. Instead of two weeks of conflicting schedules, part time faculty might find themselves facing five or six weeks of double duty. But far more significant, the long overlap could well mean that the Part Time Faculty member would have to give up one of the classes. This would mean a considerable reduction in earnings, and with a new calendar, it would probably be a permanent loss as well.

Why is the change back to a calendar that PCC and all the other community colleges in the area abandoned almost a decade ago being contemplated? This question has not been adequately addressed. Originally, the introduction of the Winter Intersession was to facilitate the transfer of students just finishing up their requirements. With a short Winter Intersession, students could complete required course work and transfer to a CU or Cal State School in the spring. Of course, with the budget cuts and roll backs of the last few years, this may not be as practical as it once was, but that doesn't justify throwing out the current calendar and stepping back to an old calendar abandoned by all local campuses some time ago.

PCC ADMINISTRATION FUMBLES ON LARGE GROUP INSTRUCTION

Large group instruction (LGI) was first adopted by the District in the early eighties as a strategy for increasing instructional efficiency and productivity in certain courses that could be delivered effectively to larger than normal numbers of students. Part of the impetus came from a large grant from the Annenberg Foundation to the Southern California Consortium for college by television. The grant provided funding for the production of several tele-courses to be developed over a period of ten years. At PCC enrollments were set at two hundred. Instructors were required to hold at least six on-campus sessions and to be available to their students at other times. Early on these were mostly taught by full time faculty who were paid a little extra to take on the extra responsibility. Over time, other courses were defined as LGI through the C&I process.

As an economic tactic LGI worked extremely well. The college receives its instructional funding based on the number of Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES). One FTES is equal to 525 hours of credit instruction. Therefore a class that enrolls two hundred students generates a little more than twenty FTES. The college receives over \$4,500 per FTES or over ninety thousand dollars for a class of two hundred. Under the term of the FA labor agreement, faculty receive some extra compensation for LGI (between three and four percent extra). The college takes the remainder to the bank. LGI functions in most divisions to balance out advanced classes that often have less than thirty students. The college has also used LGI to add seats to classes at low cost to meet enrollment objectives or simply to create added access.

Last January the District tied the acceptance of a new LGI calculation method to the offering of a retirement incentive. The FA negotiating team was told that the changes were intended to stimulate more LGI offerings to increase institutional productivity and revenue generation. The

proposal called for two steps, the recalculation of normal closing numbers (NCNs) and for a new pay rate for LGI. The last NCN calculation was done in 1982 and new one was long overdue. The rate of pay should have been subject to more thoughtful discussion but the district wanted to take the whole package to the Board before the beginning of the spring semester. The FA relented in the interest of securing the retirement incentive. The Academic Senate was tasked with creating the new NCNs.

The spring semester ended without the Senate and the C&I committee able to complete the NCN piece of the LGI puzzle. Nonetheless, last August, the Administration moved to have the new LGI rates adopted without the new NCNs. The Board voted for the proposal without the knowledge that it was unfinished. This fall semester brought with it chaos for LGI instructors. Without NCNs everyone was flying blind. Part time LGI faculty received their first LGI compensation in their November 10 checks. Full time faculty are still having their LGI pay withheld. What's the hang-up? Delaying compensation is a breach of contract and against state and federal labor law.

Now the Administration has announced that there will be no LGI for the winter intersession and the spring semester. Apparently their solution to the problem they created is to arbitrarily reduce student access by thousands of seats while cutting sections at the same time. We already have a winter intersession that has been made small enough to drown in a bathtub. Of course, this takes money away from faculty that have been given every reason to depend on it. Is this our institutional commitment to student success in action? Is the District in danger of not meeting its enrollment targets? Where is the shared governance? The FA vows that this unilateral action by the administration will not go unchallenged.

THE FA INVESTIGATES POSSIBLE FINANCIAL DISASTER TIED TO U-BUILDING ABANDONMENT

Last Spring the District declared an emergency citing the seismic threat proposed by the U-Building in the case of a major earthquake. This conclusion was based on reports by engineering firms that were already at least two years old. As if by miracle, the administration found over five million dollars lying around to construct a temporary "science village" in the southeast parking lot. Demolition and construction of a new fifty million dollar building is proposed. An additional five million dollars will need to be found to create architectural drawings to submit to the state for funding (for which, there is no guarantee). All of this at the same time we are cutting course sections to save money. At the end of FY 2001-20011 the District transferred over four million dollars from ending balances into capital accounts. At least some of this money was earmarked for growth and should have gone to offering more sections. Once again we are failing to serve our students in favor of new buildings when the possibility hasn't been completely investigated. The FA has hired its own engineering company to give a second opinion. Their preliminary report is that the calculations that were made on the U-building were grossly flawed.

CASH FLOW & SWEEPS

Dr. van Pelt's email to staff of November 30 stated: "The ending balance on June 30 had only about \$7M in cash, and about \$21M in receivables—mostly money owed to the District by the State."

What Dr. van Pelt failed to note is that the most recent 311Q for 1st quarter, FY 2011-2012 (11/2/11 BOT packet, page 51 of 104, line III, H.3.), appears to show not only the \$21 million in receivables being fully collected but also a further cash influx of over \$4 million for an ending cash balance for first quarter, FY 2011-2012, of \$32,280,225.

This first quarter ending cash balance is more than double the previous fiscal year's, as the 311Q for first quarter FY 2010-2011 showed an ending cash balance of \$15,813,652 (11/3/10 BOT packet, page 22 of 86, line III, H.3.).

The District's cash positions fluctuate. As an example,

1. The 311Q for first quarter FY 2009-2010 showed an ending cash balance of \$46,057,434, of which \$10,064,947 was from "borrowed funds" (11/04/09 BOT packet, page 20 of 65, line III.H.3.).
2. The 311Q for first quarter FY 2008-2009 showed an ending cash balance of \$11,957,089 (11/5/08 BOT packet, page 31 of 87, line III, H.3.).
3. The 311Q for first quarter FY 2007-2008 showed an ending cash balance of \$33,356,092 (11/7/07 BOT packet, page 28 of 66, line III, H.3.).

Dr. van Pelt's email stated further: "The second method is typically used at the end of the year to move one-time unspent budgeted amounts into other funds to cover one-time costs for projects. Usually this involves funding Capital Outlay or Scheduled Maintenance projects. This is known as "sweeping" the budget [of unspent money]. As noted earlier, this is how the District funds one-time projects."

The end-of-year "sweep" numbers are found in the fourth quarter 311Qs, line IV, J.2. The general fund adjusted beginning and ending balances are lines L and L.1, respectively.

	Other Outgo	Beginning Gen. Fund Balance	Ending Gen. Fund Balance	Reserve Increase/Decrease	Documented
FY 2010-2011	\$4,996,858.00	\$19,766,934.00	\$18,897,581.00	-\$869,353.00	09/07/11 BOT packet, page 18 of 80
FY 2009-2010	\$6,047,673.00	\$19,498,303.00	\$19,766,934.00	\$268,631.00	08/25/10 BOT packet, page 16 of 104
	Add'l. Year-End Adjustment			\$939,461.00	08/25/10 BOT packet, page 16 of 104
FY 2008-2009	\$1,713,284.00	\$15,862,854.00	\$18,558,842.00	\$2,695,988.00	08/19/09 BOT packet, page 18 of 145
FY 2007-2008	\$3,935,398.00	\$14,492,775.00	\$15,862,854.00	\$1,370,079.00	08/02/08 BOT packet, page 37 of 126
FY 2006-2007	\$6,249,581.00	\$12,487,182.00	\$14,492,775.00	\$2,005,593.00	08/15/07 BOT packet, page 21 of 103
FY 2005-2006	\$4,856,946.00		\$12,487,182.00		08/16/06 BOT packet, page 27 of 116
FY 2004-2005	\$4,215,828.00		\$10,960,058.00		08/16/06 BOT packet, page 27 of 116
FY 2003-2004	\$1,890,026.00		\$9,646,620.00		08/16/06 BOT packet, page 27 of 116
FY 2002-2003	\$2,400,009.00		\$6,827,774.00		08/16/06 BOT packet, page 27 of 116
Total	\$36,305,603.00				
			Gen. Fund Balance Increase	\$12,069,807.00	

Two things are clear.

First, the District's funding is cyclical. Reliance upon a snapshot picture showing the cash balance at the end of any one quarter (or at any other time) is not a true indicator of an entire fiscal year's cash flow nor indicative of the ending cash position.

Second, and more importantly, despite any cash flow variances, **for each of the past nine years, the District has either "swept" money or increased their reserves (and for 7 of the 9, they have been able to do both).**

Is funding for one-time expenditures more important than increased sections for students and/or salary adjustments for faculty and staff? We think not. It's time to reevaluate our priorities.

FALL FACC PART TIME SYMPOSIUM

Preston Rose, Vice President of the Faculty Association, and Victor Nebrida, Adjunct in Social Sciences, joined more than sixty part time faculty from all parts of the state at the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges sponsored Part Time Faculty Symposium in Cupertino during the last weekend in October. The Conference focused on the recommendations of the California Community Colleges Students Success Task Force and updated the part time faculty participants on the benefits of the CalSTRS retirement programs.

The Chancellor's Student Success Task Force was created to explore ways to better utilize state funds provided to the community colleges. Currently, troubling statistics about the success rate for students in the community college suggests that barely a quarter of newly enrolled students will complete work for an AA degree. The Legislature convened the Task Force to study the problem and proposed solutions. The Task Force's recommendations, released in September and open for comment through November at <http://studentsuccess.ideascale.com/>, stress greater student services to provide students counseling and monitoring during their time in the community college. Unfortunately, the Task Force did not deal in a forceful way with the contribution made to student success by the 45,000 part time faculty in the Community College system. One obvious issue was the proposal of the Task Force to increase Professional Development among faculty, but the Task Force made no recommendation to increase part time access to funds for professional development. Any increase in the success of students in the Community College system must bring the vast part time faculty into the mainstream.

The CalSTRS retirement program is, despite the challenges of the last several years, in solid financial condition and part time faculty who intend to remain in the community college system should consider opting for the Defined Benefit option for their retirement. The Defined Benefit program requires the participant to accumulate 5 years of service credit, but once vested, a member will receive at retirement a guaranteed monthly payment based on his or her earnings and years of service. Currently the monthly payment also has a 2% cost of living increase each year.

The FACCC Part Time Committee also met and agreed to push for the adoption of AB852, which would require community colleges to negotiate some form of rehire rights that would provide part time faculty with limited job security. The Committee has focused its attention on Senator Alan Lowenthal (27th District), Chair of the Senate Education Committee, where the bill is currently stalled. Any part time faculty member who works or lives in Senator Lowenthal's district should contact the Faculty Association to assist in this effort.

ANONYMOUS LETTER TO PCC FACULTY ASSOCIATION

Dear PCCFA,

Thank you for the information you provided in your issue of the Faculty Association bulletin about the compensation given to the new vice-presidents. Just as with the issue of realignment, the need for such extravagant increases in salary, when the state is in a prolonged economic downturn, is unclear.

For the realignment we have been offered changing reasons without explanations, such as the lack of communication, better assessment, improvement of student success, or a refusal to state any, and insist it is a "done" deal. A lack of clear reasoning on this matter leads one to think that the motives of the new president are either nebulous or less than altruistic and are better left unsaid. From the creation of the new vice-presidents, and the installation of new chairs and super deans, it seems not only that there may be no economic benefit but also that the voice of the faculty and shared governance would be submerged under another layer of bureaucracy.

With regard to the audacity of unjustified salary increases amidst the shrinkage of state revenues, we think that the money spent on these administrators should be spent on other areas that need immediate attention. The president negotiated an increased salary, an allowance of \$1,000 per month and a lengthening of the time he would be paid if he were let go before the termination of his contract. How is this an example of leadership when our staircases, corridors and classrooms are in urgent need of cleaning and our technological equipment needs upgrading? When class size is increased, and hundreds of classes, mainly taught by adjuncts, are cut, consigning the latter to the unemployment lines? The much-announced savings from the retirement of colleagues has been diverted into the coffers of a few administrators, resulting in a loss to the instructional segment of the college. Just the allowance given to each vice-president is equivalent to one class taken away from an adjunct.

We propose that if the president and his administration would like to retain trust from faculty about its true intention that it will make its plans for realignment clearer. Otherwise, the creation of the bloated administration, of which we have only seen part, will reduce the educational quality and opportunities for the average student. While the upper echelon alone costs 1.5 million dollars, the students will have over a hundred classes less. We propose that as a gesture of goodwill, that members of the administration take a salary cut of 10 percent, that having a legal counsel on campus is unnecessary, and the job be terminated. Why does the president need such counsel? The savings from the budget of the legal counsel would be enough to restore half of the classes in the proposed cut.

We feel that the Faculty Association should oppose unequivocally the approach to realignment by decree and request that the monies of the college be spent on more necessary services, particularly instruction.